REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on August 22, 2007.

Claims 1, 8, 13-15, and 21 are amended; as a result, claims 1-26 are now pending in this application.

Example support for the amendments may be found in a variety of locations throughout the original filed specification; for example, the Examiner's attention is directed to the original filed specification page 9 lines 1-19; page 11 lines 4-12 and 23-30; page 12 lines 5-9; and page 13 lines 19-21 and line 20 continuing to page 14 line 14.

Information Disclosure Statement (IDS)

The Examiner indicated that there was no copy of the WebStar Security Toolkit Trouble Shooting Reference supplied by the Applicant in the prior IDS filed with the application and as such had not considered it. Applicant is supply said copy herewith such that the Examiner can now properly consider and note this reference in the file history. Additionally, Applicant notes that other references are also be filed herewith as a supplemental IDS for the Examiner's consideration along with the proper fee for such consideration.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. The adjustments to the claims suggested by the Examiner to overcome this rejection were made above by way of amendments. Accordingly, these rejections are no longer appropriate and should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Birrell et al. (U.S. 5,805,803) in view of Cohen et al. (Proceedings of the ACM SIGCOMM '98 Conference on Applications, technologies, architectures, and protocols for computer communication SIGCOMM '98, Volume 28, Issue 4 (©1998 ACM); hereinafter referred to as "Cohen"). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection that each

and every limitation in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references.

The certificate discussed in the Birrell reference is stored as a token or cookie on the client computer as part of authentication. Birrell, column 2 lines 41-43.

What neither reference discusses or address is having intermediate secure communication sessions between the parties involved using session keys. One set of session keys unique to communication between a local domain accelerator and the external domain and one set of session keys unique to communication between a client and the local domain accelerator. Moreover, the client receives a certificate that it believes to be external domain but the client is communicating directly wit the local domain accelerator. These limitations in one form or another are now presented in the independent claims above.

Consequently, the proposed combination lacks each and every limitation defined in the amended independent claims and as such the rejections of record should be withdrawn. Applicant respectfully requests an indication of the same.

Reservation of Rights

In the interest of clarity and brevity, Applicant may not have equally addressed every assertion made in the Office Action, however, this does not constitute any admission or acquiescence. Applicant reserves all rights not exercised in connection with this response, such as the right to challenge or rebut any tacit or explicit characterization of any reference or of any of the present claims, the right to challenge or rebut any asserted factual or legal basis of any of the rejections, the right to swear behind any cited reference such as provided under 37 C.F.R. § 1.131 or otherwise, or the right to assert co-ownership of any cited reference. Applicant does not admit that any of the cited references or any other references of record is relevant to the present claims, or that they constitute prior art. To the extent that any rejection or assertion is based upon the Examiner's personal knowledge, rather than any objective evidence of record as manifested by a cited prior art reference, Applicant timely objects to such reliance on Official Notice, and reserves all rights to request that the Examiner provide a reference or affidavit in support of such assertion, as required by MPEP § 2144.03. Applicant reserves all rights to pursue any cancelled claims in a subsequent patent application claiming the benefit of priority of

the present patent application, and to request rejoinder of any withdrawn claim, as required by
MPEP § 821.04.

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111
Serial Number: 10/814,983
Filing Date: March 31, 2004
Title: TECHNIQUES FOR SECURELY ACCELERATING EXTERNAL DOMAINS LOCALLY

Page 11
Dkt: 1565.069US1

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG & WOESSNER, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date _____ 11/21/07 _____   By /_____ /
                                      Joseph P. Mehrle
                                      Reg. No. 45,535